



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/663,363	09/15/2000	Yoon Kean Wong	PALM-3303.US.P	2503

7590                    04/03/2003

Wagner Murabito & Hao L L P  
Two North Market Street Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

KAPADIA, MILAN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3626	

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/663,363	WONG, YOON KEAN
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Milan S Kapadia	3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

**Notice to Applicant**

1. This communication is in response to the application filed 15 September 2000.  
Claims 1-20 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goyal et al. (5,873,108) in view of Kayabu et al. (6,026,333).

- (A) As per claim 1, Goyal teaches a computer implemented of automating categorization of data comprising:  
determining a time of day (Goyal; abstract, col. 8, lines 35-38, and col. 11, lines 21-25);

setting a default data category based upon the time of day and the time of day profile (Goyal; col. 11, lines 21-25; the Examiner interprets the “current day” as the “default category.”)

Goyal fails to expressly teach referencing a time of day profile that correlates time of day information with data categories. However, this feature is old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Kayabu’s teachings with regards to referencing a time of day profile that correlates time of day information with data categories (Kayabu; abstract; the Examiner interprets the “category definition dictionary” as the “time of day profile.”) It is respectfully submitted, that it would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to expand the system taught by Goyal with Kayabu’s teaching with regards to this limitation, with the motivation of determining the categorization rules associated with a time of day and related data categories (Kayabu; col. 1, lines 60-col. 2, line 5).

(B) As per claim 2, Goyal fails to expressly teach wherein the time of day profile correlates a time with at least one of a personal data category and a business category. However, this feature is old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Kayabu’s teachings with regards to wherein the time of day profile correlates a time with at least one of a personal data category and a business category (Kayabu; col. 7, lines 35-53). It is respectfully submitted, that it would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to expand the system taught by Goyal with Kayabu’s teaching with regards to this limitation, with the

motivation of associating a time of day with at least one of a related personal data category and a business category (Kayabu; col. 1, lines 60-col. 2, line 5).

(C) As per claim 3, Goyal teaches wherein the computer implemented method is carried out within a personal information manager program operating on a programmed processor residing within a palmtop computer (Goyal; col. 3, lines 50-60).

(D) As per claim 4, Goyal teaches displaying only data categorized in the default data category and hiding information categorized in any other category (Goyal; figure 3 and col. 11, lines 21-25).

(E) As per claim 5, Goyal teaches entering data categorized in the default category (Goyal; col. 11, lines 28-31).

(F) Claims 6 and 7 differ from 5 and 4, respectively, by reciting “providing an option to change the default data category to a selected data category.” The combined system of Goyal and Kayabu collectively fail to expressly teach this limitation. However, since the combined system of Goyal and Kayabu collectively do teach providing an option of manually changing data categories (Goyal; col. 8, lines 31-46) the default data category is the initial data category where data can be entered, it is respectfully submitted, that it would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made, to expand the system taught by Goyal and Kayabu to provide an option to change the default data category to a selected data category, with the motivation of enabling the user to specify which data category should the data be entered in.

(G) As per claim 8, Goyal teaches wherein the data comprises one of address book data, to-do list data, notes data, email data and calendar data (Goyal; col. 2, lines 40-56).

(H) Apparatus claims 9-15 repeat the subject matter of method claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, respectively as a set of apparatus elements rather than a series of steps. As the underlying processes of claims 1, 2, and 4-8 have been shown to be fully disclosed by the teachings of Goyal and Kayabu in the above rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4-8, it is readily apparent that the system disclosed by Goyal and Kayabu include the apparatus to perform these functions. As such, these limitations are rejected for the same reasons given above for method claims 1, 2, and 4-8, and incorporated herein.

(I) Claims 16-20 differs from method claims 1, 2 and 8, 3, 6, and 7 by reciting a “an electronic storage medium containing instructions, which when carried out on a programmed processor...” in the preamble. As per this limitation, Goyal system is implemented on a computer (Goyal; col. 3, lines 1150-61). As such, Goyal implicitly

includes computer elements such as a programmed computer readable medium. The remainder of claims 16-20 repeat the limitations of claim 1-3 and 6-8, and are therefore rejected for the same reasons given above for claim 1-3 and 6-8.

### ***Conclusion***

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied art teaches a schedule and to-do list for a pen-based computer system (5,570,1090); a method for controlling a computerized organizer (5,457,476); a voice activated personal organizer (5,602,963); a biorhythms analog computer-calendar (4,551,620); a system and method for creating pattern-recognizing computer structures from example text (5,864,789); a method and system for automatically integrating scheduled work items onto an electronic calendar (5,899,979); a method and apparatus for randomly generating information for subsequent correlating (5,917,493); a method and system for resolving temporal descriptors of data records in a computer system (6,345,268); and an intelligent agent for executing delegated tasks (5,983,200).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Milan S Kapadia whose telephone number is 703-305-3887. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. In addition the examiner can be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 703-305-9588. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

mk

April 1, 2003

  
DINH X. NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER